



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

what we have got—if we can—matters not how we got it. But we must not get any more,—for ten years. John Bull must rest till his dinner digests. We do not want any Chinaman to eat. We should have nothing to do with any proposed division of China. The fiscal *status quo* in the East may be enforced if we enter into a league of peace and fair trade—with the United States especially. A policy of honesty and truth should be followed in India. Any one proposing the extension of British sovereignty among the hill tribes should be hanged. We must stay at Berber on the Nile—unless we can get to Khartoum by water. We must keep on our own territories in the Hinterland of Lagos. A policy of appeasement and reconciliation must be followed in South Africa. ‘First things first’; and the first thing is the maintenance of the navy. Without that Great Britain would be gobbled up like a huge plum-pudding. The army must be also readjusted to fit it to the extended empire which it must defend. What the ablest soldiers recommend, that must be done without any nonsense. But above all things British industry, British manufacturing supremacy must be revived and reestablished. The old policy of *laissez faire* has broken down. Anything to make English business go. The condition of the toilers must be carefully looked after. If all this is not done soon, the British empire is doomed. Poor ostrich! She must not stick her head in the sand and await her doom.”

The navy first, the army next, British imperialism, British supremacy on the sea, British commercial supremacy everywhere, holding all you have, resting and digesting before proceeding to take more, and all this spiced up somewhat with improvement of the people at home and with common sense and the Ten Commandments abroad, that is the great editor’s picturesque worldly-moral program for his country.

The new Christian reform daily *The Commonwealth*, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, it is to be hoped will be longer lived than some others of its class have been. It issues no “Sunday” edition, and no work upon it is done on that day. It has at once placed itself on record as strongly opposed to all pension abuses, and against all bidding for the soldiers’ vote by the continuance of unjust pension legislation. It is distinctly for international arbitration and the ways of peace. In an editorial referring to some recent remarks by Charles H. Cramp, the builder of war-ships, it says:

“*The Commonwealth* will go as far as Mr. Cramp in condemnation of silly persons who think it their duty to wear English clothing, imitate English modes of speech and ape the follies of English society. But *The Commonwealth* is no jingo, has no sympathy with the jingo spirit; is opposed to the impudent, domineering and aggressive spirit falsely called ‘the American policy,’ and has a supreme contempt for the counterfeit patriotism which insists that an American who is not always making faces at some other nation—preferably England—is a poor cur,

unworthy of citizenship in this ‘land of the free and home of the brave.’ It is quite possible for a people to be self-respecting and yet peaceable, and we do not see how a Christian nation can be a glowering advocate of war upon the most frivolous pretext. Mr. Cramp’s business has perverted his judgment.”

Brevities.

Mr. Frederic Passy, the indefatigable apostle of peace, gave during the month of January in the south of France, a series of lectures on disarmament—immediate, gradual, proportionate disarmament. The same lectures had previously been given during the month of December at various places in and about Paris.

. . . On the occasion of his installation recently, the new Lord Mayor of Dublin was accompanied from the Mansion House to the City Hall by a civic procession. The program as originally drawn up included a military escort, but in deference to the wishes of the Nationalists, who objected to the military element, this feature of the program was omitted. The Unionist members of the Corporation protested against the Mayor’s action, and refused to join in the procession.

. . . For arraigning the French government for its conduct in the Dreyfus affair Emile Zola has been sentenced to one year’s imprisonment and a fine of three thousand francs. Outside of France, the general opinion is that the trial was a mere travesty of justice, all evidence by which Zola might have sustained himself being ruled out of court.

. . . The Spanish man-of-war Vizcaya has made its “friendly” call in New York harbor, and gone away. Our government took every precaution that the vessel should incur no risk while in American waters.

. . . Count Muravieff, the Russian minister for foreign affairs, has announced that all North China ports which shall hereafter be under Russian control will be freely open to the commerce of the world.

. . . The International Peace Association of Journalists recently organized at Paris, celebrated its establishment by a grand banquet on the evening of February 26th. The speakers were Mr. Frederic Passy, Senator Trarieux, Messrs. Barodet, Berthelot, Sorel and Merillon, all of whom are members of the *Comité d’honneur*.

. . . During the recent excitement over the destruction of the Maine, Congressman Boutelle, chairman of the House Committee on Naval affairs, said that he considered any man who by speech or writing tried to influence public sentiment at such a time as guilty as the man who would touch a match to the powder magazine of a vessel. It was a time for calmest judgment instead of unguarded talk of a war which would entail the loss of thousands upon thousands of people.

. . . Our Ambassador at Berlin has secured a revision of the order excluding American fresh fruit from Prussia. Dried fruit and all fresh fruit that is not infected will be

permitted to enter. The order was originally issued to protect German fruit against infection from the San Jose louse carried in by American fruit, and not in retaliation, as was charged.

... At a banquet at Madrid on February 25th to Señor Bernabe, the new Spanish minister to Washington, our Ambassador, General Woodford, spoke in the strongest terms for peace between the two countries. His words produced a strong revulsion of feeling among the Spanish in favor of America.

The Annexation of Hawaii.

BY PROFESSOR H. E. VON HOLST, PH.D.

Address delivered before the Commercial Club of Chicago,
Jan. 29, 1898.

That the Sandwich Islands are one of the fairest spots on God's earth, and of considerable economical value, nobody gainsays. I, however, hold myself justified in passing by this side of the question, for the simple reason that all the economical advantages to be derived from them can be secured without annexation, nay, are secured already. That the future will change nothing in this respect against the will of the United States is certain, because the immutable facts of the case render it palpably and eminently the interest of the islands to maintain the established economic relation with this country.

The second reason adduced for annexation is the alleged great value of the islands from a military point of view. Some weeks ago, I was triumphantly told that, as to this, all our naval officers are agreed, and I raised great laughter at my expense by replying that I could by no means recognize our naval officers as an authority whose *ipse dixit* settles this question. At the risk of meeting here with the same fate, I repeat this declaration. *A priori*, our naval officers cannot be considered wholly impartial witnesses. It is to be presumed that they will be more or less biased in favor of whatever tends to increase the import of their vocation. This is no reproach, but simply saying that even our naval officers are heirs to human nature. Does the past history of mankind not warrant the statement that the military have been fully as prone as other mortals to view public problems through the medium of their class-interest? Besides, it will have to be admitted to be at least a possibility that the perspective of military men may be marred by taking a somewhat one-sided, what I should call a too technical view of it. Into military questions of this character largely enter factors which common sense is fully capable of judging correctly. And, finally, I do not hesitate to venture the assertion, though it may expose me to the charge of egotism and arrogance—in military questions of this character, also, historians can lay some claim to speaking as experts. It goes without saying, that this does not extend to tactical and strategic questions, partaking of a strictly technical character and requiring a knowledge of practical details. But if they have studied the military history of the world with open eyes, they must be perfectly familiar with and competent to judge of the general facts and causes on which military strength or weakness necessarily depends. In this re-

spect, an able historian even holds vantage ground over the majority of military men. If these are not also, to some extent, historians, with a dash of statesmanship in their intellectual makeup, their very mastery of the more technical sides of their profession can easily become a film over their eyes as to these general facts and causes. The historian, lacking this kind of knowledge, can only take a bird's-eye view, and that does not offer such obstruction.

Let us, however, grant, for a moment, that the military value of the islands is all our naval men claim. Ought that to determine us, in case military objections to annexation must be admitted to exist in other respects? I think clearly not, because I confidently defy any one to successfully refute the assertion that we can never have a war unless it be of our own seeking, and, therefore, the advantage would be merely a fictitious gain, so long as we do not put it to improper and harmful use. So long as we do not demand of other nations more than is justly our due, and do not force them to the alternative of drawing their sword or letting their honor be trampled upon, they, without a single exception, will never appeal to the *ultima ratio*. The reason is neither that they love us so much, nor that they stand in such awe of our military resources, but simply that they are not idiots. Unless their potentates and ministers are idiots, they cannot fail to see that, in the given and unalterable condition of things, even a successful war would be to them absolutely barren of any advantages, and that even the most successful war would impose upon themselves incalculable sacrifices. A cession of territory is out of the question, for territory of the United States—with the exception of uncoveted Alaska—being compact and extending over half a continent, the ceded strip of land would be simply an earnest of eternally renewed wars till it was regained; and the Franco-German war of 1870-71 has forever settled the question that the greatest war indemnity which can possibly be imposed upon a vanquished country, falls far short of the expenses of the victorious nation. For these reasons, the United States are the one nation on earth whose peace is wholly in its own hands.

That we can, nevertheless, sooner or later be involved in a war, is unfortunately only too true. Therefore, it is proper to compare our actual condition with what it will be after annexation.

Our Western coast, say the annexationists, is dangerously exposed; the way to it will be most effectively blocked to every enemy if Hawaii is ours, for the hold of no man-of-war is big enough to steam from Asia to Australia over the vast Pacific without recoaling, and that can be done only at Hawaii. It must be conceded that there is some truth in this, but if we look a little closer we will become satisfied that, after all, it does by far not amount to as much as it would seem at first sight. And just as to that power with which we are the likeliest to clash, and whose navy is equal to the combined naval forces of any other two powers, it is of the least consequence. John Bull is still so large a land-holder on the Western coast of America that he need not defer striking a blow at us on the Pacific till he has got his war-ships over from Asia and Australia. As to all other powers, we would only gain some time by this coaling question, valuable, indeed, but by no means of decisive import. There is no means of effectively protecting our shipping but by an adequate navy, and our seaports can be suc-